



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/555,709	07/19/2000	ANDREAS FERENCZ	H2933/3578UA	9120

7590 11/27/2002  
Rocco S. Barrese, Esq.  
Dilworth & Barrese, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard  
Uniondale, NY 11553

EXAMINER

SHORT, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1712

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2002

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No. 09/555704	Applicant(s) Ferencz et al.
Examiner Short	Group Art Unit 1712

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

**Status**

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on October 21, 2002
- This action is **FINAL**.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 111; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- Claim(s) 1, 19-47 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1, 19-47 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)**

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_
  - received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment(s)**

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Office Action Summary**

Art Unit: 1712

This action is in response to the request for continued examination (RCE) and preliminary amendment filed on October 21, 2002.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 19, 20, 22-41, 43-45 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Support for component A that comprises an aromatic-containing polyester is not apparent. The subgenus of aromatic-containing polyesters is not described in the specification as filed. The only species of aromatic-containing polyesters described for use in the invention are those synthesized from an aromatic polycarboxylic acid, an aliphatic polycarboxylic acid and an alcohol component. See the specification at page 9, line 26 through page 14, line 16 and examples. Since the application as filed contained neither a description of the subgenus aromatic-containing polyesters nor a description of species that in the aggregate amount to the same thing, it does not support a subgenus of aromatic-containing polyesters as component A. See *In re Welstead* 174 USPQ 449 (CCPA 1972).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1712

Claims 1 and 19-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller. The reference teaches an adhesive composition comprising a blend of amorphous polyesters that have an inherent viscosity from 0.1 to 0.6 and a Tg below 60° C. The number average ( $M_n$ ) molecular weight of the adhesive composition can be as high as 20,000 with a preferred molecular weight as high as 10,000. See col. 5, line 3 through col. 9, line 52. While lower molecular weight adhesives are preferred for wider application, higher molecular weight adhesive have higher tensile strength and peel strength. See col. 8, lines 47-54. It would have been obvious to select a polyester having a number average molecular weight above 8,000 as one of the amorphous polyesters and use in combination with an amorphous polyester having a molecular weight below 8,000 and a Tg below 60° C in order to obtain adhesives having higher molecular weights and improved tensile strength and peel strength.

P. Short

November 21, 2002

Phone (703) 308-2395

Fax (703) 872-9310

PATRICIA A. SHORT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Patricia A. Short*